

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings amend Figs. 1A and 4A to include prior art legends. These sheets, which include Figs. 1A and 4A, replace the original sheets including Figs. 1A and 4A.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings, objected to the specification, and rejected claims 1, 4-15, 19, 20, 23 and 24 under 35 USC § 102(e). These objections and rejections are fully traversed below.

Claims 1, 3, 12-15, 17, 20, 22 and 24 have been amended to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. In addition, claims 2, 16, and 21 have been cancelled from the application without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 3-15, 17-20 and 22-24 are pending. In addition, a few minor amendments have been to the specification to correct informalities identified by the Examiner.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings because the Examiner believes that figures 1A, 1B and 4A should be labeled as “Prior Art”. Applicants submit together herewith amended figures 1A and 4A that includes the “Prior Art” legend as requested by the Examiner. However, with respect to figure 1B, the Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner because the computer system illustrated in figure 1B includes a mass storage 150 that can be further depicted as shown in figure 2A as an example. Hence, the mass storage 150 may include structure or functionality associated with the invention. Accordingly, it is submitted that it is more appropriate for figure 1B to not include the “Prior Art” legend. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the drawings.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification due to the title of the invention not being adequately descriptive as well as other minor informalities. Applicant has amended the specification to change the title of the invention to “DISK ACCELERATION USING FIRST AND SECOND STORAGE DEVICES”. In addition, other amendments to the specification correct informalities identified by the Examiner. Hence, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the specification.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 4-15, 19, 20, 23 AND 24 UNDER 35 USC §102(e)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-15, 19, 20, 23 and 24 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Stence et al., US Patent No. 6,646,948. In addition, the Examiner stated that claims 2, 3, 16-18, 21 and 22 recite allowable subject matter. Accordingly, to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended the pending claims to substantially correspond to the subject matter that has already been indicated to be allowable by the Examiner. In this regard, claim 1 has been amended to substantially include the limitations

previously recited in claim 2. Claim 14 has been amended to recite the limitations previously recited in claim 16. Claim 20 has been amended to recite the limitations previously recited in claim 21. Claim 22, which was indicated to recite allowable subject matter, has been placed in independent form. Claim 14 has been amended to substantially include the limitations previously recited in claim 16. Similarly, claim 24 (although in computer readable medium format) has been amended to substantially include the limitations previously recited in claim 16. Claims 12 and 13 have also been amended to include limitations similar to those identified as corresponding to allowable subject matter. Based on these amendments, it is submitted that the rejection under 35 USC § 102(e) is moot and warrants no further discussion. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 USC § 102(e).

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the drawings and the specification are no longer objectionable. In addition, it is submitted that claims 1, 3-15, 17-20 and 22-24 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0388 (Order No. SDK1P019).

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



C. Douglass Thomas
Reg. No. 32,947

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300